

communicator, the second wireless communicator, and a base station. Dependent claims 3 and 18 have been amended to conform to the amendments to claims 1 and 15, respectively, by changing "external device" to "base station". Dependent claims 26 and 27 have been added to specify the type of communication between the first and second wireless communicators. A new abstract which more clearly reflects the invention to which the amended claims are directed has been substituted for the previously submitted abstract.

The amendments to the abstract and claims made herein do not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. Instead, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to further define the manner of communication between the first wireless communicator, the second wireless communicator, and a base station, dependent claims 3 and 18 have been amended to conform to the amendments to claims 1 and 15, respectively, dependent claims 26 and 27 have been added to define with more specificity the type of communication between the first and second wireless communicators, and a new abstract which more clearly reflects the invention to which the amended claims are directed has been substituted for the previously submitted abstract, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the abstract and claims by the current amendment. The attached pages i-iv are captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE".

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of their application in light of the following discussion.

Traversal of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner contends that the recitation "a remaining charge of a battery of the first information processing device" is unclear. Applicants respectfully traverse this contention.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, which, in relevant part, provides:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The "distinctly claiming" requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph means that the claims must have a clear and definite meaning when construed in light of the complete patent document. Miles Laboratories, Inc. v. Shandon, Inc., 27 USPQ2d 1123, 1126 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In the specification (page 13, lines 2-9) and Fig. 4, applicants disclose an embodiment of the information processing system recited in the claims where data information displayed by the display 120 of the second information processing device corresponds to a remaining battery charge (battery symbol 401), a communication state (antenna symbol 402), and current date, day and time.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the language of claim 2 "particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention", as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. When read in light of the complete patent document, as directed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the language of claim 2 is without any ambiguity.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

#### Brief Summary of the Invention

The present invention is directed to an information processing system, an information processing method, and a computer-readable recording medium for executing the information processing method on a computer.

As described in the specification (pages 1-2), conventional information processing devices, such as portable telephones, have very small display screens due to the requirement for miniaturization of these devices. As a result, the amount of information that can be displayed in the display screens of conventional portable information processing devices is limited. Furthermore, with a portable telephone, it is very difficult to view the display screen during a phone conversation when the portable telephone is in contact with the user's ear.

The present invention overcomes the drawbacks of the conventional art. Figs. 1-2 show an embodiment of an information processing system according to the present invention embodied in the claims. The information processing system has a first information processing device 100 having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display 110 for displaying the data information. A second information processing device 101 has a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device 100 by wireless communication and a display 120 for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display 110 of the first information processing device 100.

In one embodiment, the data information displayed by the display 120 of the second information processing device 101 corresponds to information relating to a remaining charge of a battery of the first information processing device 100 (e.g., battery symbol 401 in Fig. 4). In another embodiment, the data information displayed by the display 120 of the second information processing device 101 corresponds to information relating to an ongoing communication state between the first information processing device 100 and an external device (e.g., antenna symbol 402 in Fig. 4).

In another aspect, as illustrated in the flowchart of Fig. 3, the present invention is directed an information processing method utilizing the information processing system of the present invention as described above. In yet another aspect, the present invention is directed to a computer-readable recording medium for storing a program for processing a computer to execute the information processing method according to the present invention.

By the foregoing information processing system and method according to the present invention, the content of a display of a first information processing device can be easily confirmed by viewing the display of a second information processing device, particularly when it is difficult to view the display of the first information processing device.

Traversal of Prior Art Rejections

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 19 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Panasik. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18, 19 and 21-24 recite subject matter which is not identically disclosed or described in Panasik.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to an information processing system and requires a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information, and a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device. No corresponding structural combination is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 8 is directed to an information processing method and requires the steps of providing a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data

information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a first display for displaying the data information, providing a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator and a second display, and operating the second information processing device so that the second wireless communicator receives data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and the second display displays data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the first display. No corresponding combination of steps is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 15 is directed to an information processing system and requires a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information, a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying information, display control means for controlling the display of the second information processing device to display data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing

device. Again, no corresponding structural combination is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Panasik discloses a wireless network in which calculators 36, 38 transmit wireless signals between one another through a distributed antenna system 40. However, Panasik does not disclose or describe a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information, and a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device, as required by independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

In Panasik, communication is made between calculators 36 and 38 only. There is no disclosure in Panasik of communication between a first information processing device and a base station, a first display for displaying information transmitted between the first information processing device and the base station, communication between the first information processing device and a second information processing device, and a second display for displaying



information corresponding to information displayed by the first display, as required by independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

In the absence of the foregoing disclosure recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15, anticipation cannot be found. See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Associates v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) ("Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration"); Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1748 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ("When more than one reference is required to establish unpatentability of the claimed invention anticipation under § 102 can not be found."); Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added) ("Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim").

Stated otherwise, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. This standard is clearly not satisfied by Panasik for the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Panasik does not suggest the claimed subject matter and, therefore, would not have motivated one skilled in the art to modify Panasik's wireless network to arrive at the claimed invention.

Claims 2, 6, 21-24, 10, and 18-19 depend on and contain all of the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 1, 8 and 15.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Prater. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik and Prater do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 2, 17 and 25.

Panasik does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in amended independent claims 1 and 15 as set forth above for the rejection of claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18-19 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 2, 25 and 17 depend on and contain all of the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 15, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 1 and 15.

The secondary reference to Prater has been cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of a communications transceiver in which information relating to a remaining charge of a battery of a processing device is displayed. However, Prater clearly does not disclose or suggest the

structural combination of the information processing system recited in amended independent claims 1 and 15, from which claims 1, 25 and 17 respectively depend. Since Prater does not disclose or suggest the structural features recited in claims 1 and 15, it does not cure the deficiencies of Panasik. Accordingly, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have been led to modify the references to attain the claimed subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 17 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of Prater be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of William. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combined teachings of Panasik and William do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 11 and 16.

Panasik does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in amended independent claims 8 and 15 as set forth above for the rejection of claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, 15, 18-19 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 11 and 16 depend on and contain all of the limitations of amended independent claims 8 and 15, respectively, and, therefore,

distinguish from the references at least in the same manner as claims 8 and 15.

The secondary reference to William has been cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of a computer readable recording medium for storing a program for processing a computer to execute an information processing method. However, William clearly does not disclose or suggest the structural combination of the information processing system recited in amended independent claims 8 and 15, from which claims 11 and 16 respectively depend. Since William does not disclose or suggest the structural features recited in claims 8 and 15, it does not cure the deficiencies of Panasik. Accordingly, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have been led to modify the references to attain the claimed subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasik in view of William be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added claims 26-27, which depend on amended independent claim 1, also patentably distinguish from the prior art of record.

The amendments to the abstract and claims made herein do not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. Instead, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have

been amended to further define the manner of communication between the first wireless communicator, the second wireless communicator, and a base station, dependent claims 3 and 18 have been amended to conform to the amendments to claims 1 and 15, respectively, new claims 26 and 27 have been added to define with more specificity the type of communication between the first and second wireless communicators, and a new abstract which more clearly reflects the invention to which the amended claims are directed has been substituted for the previously submitted abstract, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and discussion, the application is believed to be in allowable form. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
ADAMS & WILKS

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce J. Adams  
Reg. No. 25,386

50 Broadway - 31st Floor  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 809-3700

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE ABSTRACT:

The previously submitted abstract has been amended as follows:

An information processing system has a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information. A second information processing device has a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information [by wireless communication] from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device.

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1, 3, 8, 15 and 18 have been amended as follows:

1. (Thrice Amended) An information processing system comprising:

a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data

information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information; and

a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information [by wireless communication] from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device.

3. (Thrice Amended) An information processing system according to claim 1; wherein the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to an ongoing communication state between the first information processing device and the base station [an external device].

8. (Thrice Amended) An information processing method, comprising the steps of:

providing a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a first display for displaying the data information;

providing a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator and a second display; and

operating the second information processing device so that the second wireless communicator receives and sends data information [by wireless communication] from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and the second display displays data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the first display.

15. (Twice Amended) An information processing system comprising:

a first information processing device having a first wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information from and to a base station by wireless communication and a display for displaying the data information;

a second information processing device having a second wireless communicator for receiving and sending data information [by wireless communication] from and to the first information processing device by wireless communication and a display for displaying information; and

display control means for controlling the display of the second information processing device to display data information corresponding to the data information displayed by the display of the first information processing device.

-iii-



18. (Twice Amended) An information processing system according to claim 15; wherein the data information displayed by the display of the second information processing device corresponds to information relating to an ongoing communication state between the first information processing device and [an external device] the base station.